

Proposed Figure 2 is a schematic representation of the tag interrogation system of the present invention in which tags 28 provided on packages are addressed by interrogator 26 provided in portal 24.

Proposed Figure 3 is a schematic representation of tags 28 receiving a signal from the transmitter of interrogator 26 and responding with a signal received by the receiver of interrogator 26.

Proposed Figure 4 is a schematic representation of tag 28 showing power supply 34 which provides the power to operate receiver 36, processor 38 and transmitter 40.

No new matter is presented in proposed Figures 2-4 as all the features therein are set forth in the Specification. If proposed Figures 2-4 are acceptable, applicants will amend the Specification in an appropriate manner.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure on page 12, lines 2 and 4-6 because of a typographical error. Applicants have corrected the typographical errors kindly identified by the Examiner. Applicants have also corrected a typographical error appearing on page 5.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under Section 112 as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that by this

Amendment they have amended the claims to correct the informalities identified by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 12 and 14-15 under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Barrett. The Examiner rejected claim 13 under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Barrett. Finally, the Examiner objected to claims 3, 5-11, and 16-18 but indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under Section 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, applicants have cancelled claims 2 and 3 and added the limitations of those claims to claim 1. Applicants have also rewritten claims 5 and 16 in independent form. By virtue of these amendments, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-13 and 16-18 are now allowable.

Applicants have amended claim 14 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. However, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable over Barrett.

Barrett is directed to a tag to portal communication system in which the portal continually radiates an interrogation signal followed by a listening interval. Column 18, lines 1-40 of Barrett describe the situation in which two tags are within the interrogation field of a portal. In such an event, if the

carrier signals from the tags are out-of-phase, the preambles to the tags will be lost. The portal then sends out the same request after a randomly-selected time interval. Such a second request does not bisect an address range as required by claim 14 because the same request is transmitted.

In the event that the carrier signals from the tags occur simultaneously, the signals from the tags will be summed. In the region where the codes from each of the tags differ, there will be a loss of clock signal, which bars further reception by the portal until another preamble is received. Any subsequent preamble reception will not be the result of bisection of the address range. For this reason, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, and claim 15 which depends therefrom, are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 4-18 define patentably over the cited art. Allowance of claims 1 and 4-18 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted



Michael L. Dever  
Registration No. 32,216  
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C.  
56th Floor  
600 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219  
Attorneys for Applicants